E+52

25 <b>X</b> 1	MEMORANDUM FOR:	Chief, Supply Division, OL			
	FROM:	Chief, Information and Management Support Staff			
	SUBJECT:	Expendability Criteria			
	REFERENCE:	Memo Same Subject - OL 14135-87			
25 <b>X</b> 1	l. IMSS has evaluated the referenced memorandum and after consultations with several experienced Logistics Officers, arrived at a consensus opinion regarding each of the points suggested by Supply Division. To conform with your memo we will address each point chronologically and provide our recommendations in the concluding summary.				
	a. Historically, the expendability dollar value criteria of accountable property has periodically undergone review to compensate for inflation, changes in values of specific items, net gain for expenditure of available resources, and other factors relative to protection of accountable property. Over the years we have raised the minimum dollar value incrementally from \$10 to the current \$300 level. Although this may be a point in time to perform another review of the minimum dollar value of accountable property, IMSS is not aware of a specific requirement to do so. (We also question if the reason for the \$500 criteria to comply with Federal Acquisition Regulation small purchase provisions was selected "because it isn't worth the paperwork".) Should the minimum dollar value be raised, the overall workload may not be significantly reduced because approximately 50% of the				
25 <b>X</b> 1	former accou appeal crite	eria, which requires another form of control.			
	employee bed employees in compliance we excellent so	b. In at least one situation, OL had to dismiss an employee because of theft. OF has dismissed several employees in recent years. Polygraphs do not ensure compliance with regulations; however, the polygraph is an excellent source of detection of potential problems and therefore serves as a deterrent to most employees in this			
25 <b>X</b> 1	respect.	47 NG			
25X1 25X1					

SUBJECT: Expendability Criteria

25X1

25X1

25 <b>X</b> 1	clearly describe personal	appeal items and	give
	examples of property that	normally fall int	to this category.
	These regulations provide	specific guidance	e for the control
25X1	of personal appeal items.		

- c. The primary goal should be to protect valuable property and maintain accountability and, if possible, not impose a formidable workload in the process. The minimum dollar value is open to question, and as mentioned previously, has been changed over the years. Although we do not want to overburden administrative officers, we are responsible for the management and control of property.
- d. The value of an item is not reduced because of its location. Therefore, whatever minimum value is established (presently \$300) forms the basis of accountability. The fact that a "small station" may only contribute an insignificant percentage to the Agency's total holdings of accountable property does not negate the requirement to monitor, control, and report this activity. However, it may be feasible to operationally expend some of this property upon issue in some circumstances. The bottom line is that a "small station" is just as accountable as a "large station". The fact that the figures are lower does not eliminate the responsibility for accountability.
- 2. IMSS recommends that the control of Government property be maintained at all activities, regardless of size. We further recommend that the minimal value of accountable property be lowered to \$200, but that the personal appeal item category be eliminated. Thus, any item with a unit cost of at least \$200 would be subject to defined monitoring, control, and reporting procedures. Furthermore, the accountable officer in coordination with the chief of the activity should be free to select the necessary criteria at their particular location, relative to the idiosyncrasies of locale and regardless of value, which would determine those "special items" they desire to selectively control via the hand receipt method.
- 3. As the Agency becomes more subjective to oversight via Freedom of Information acceptability, we must be responsive and improve our accountability controls. This is not the time to significantly loosen our control mechanisms. Subsequently, since

2

SUBJECT: Expendability Criteria

25X1

25**X**1

current regulations provide sufficient guidance for control of Government property and there is no strong justification to change the expendability criteria, our prime recommendation is to maintain the status quo.

3

SUBJECT: Expendability Criteria

Distribution:
Orig - Addressee

25X1

/1 - OL Files 1 - OL Reader

1 - IMSS Official

1 - IMSS Chrono

OL/IMSS/JS:dr (5Mar87)